

SOLUTION BOUNDS FOR A HYPOTHETICAL POLYNOMIAL TIME APROXIMATION ALGORITHM FOR THE TSP

A. G. YAN EFF

ABSTRACT. Bounds for the optimal tour length for a hypothetical TSP algorithm are derived.

The present is an exemplification of part of [4], and contains some points made in [3] in reference to the TSP.

Consider the hypothetical (and restricted) problem:

Given¹ (E, d) , construct such $S \subseteq E$, such that (i)² $1 \leq \frac{\|S\|}{\|S_0\|} \leq \xi$;
(ii) S is of structure as that of S_0 ; and (iii) $|S| = |S_0|$, where $\|S_0\|$
is an extremal³ value.

The ratio $1 \leq \frac{\|S\|}{\|S_0\|} \leq \xi$ is examined. For simplicity⁴ (ii) and (iii) are presumed to be satisfied by the *PTA*, which constructs an approximate solution for the TSP. In a disciplined-like way this is specified as:

$$\{S = \emptyset\} \textbf{PTA} \{S = S_{(|S_0|)} \wedge S \subseteq E \wedge |S| = |S_0| \wedge 1 \leq \frac{\|S_{(|S_0|)}\|}{\|S_0\|} \leq \xi\}$$

ξ as bound on the performance⁵ ratio $\frac{\|S_{(|S_0|)}\|}{\|S_0\|}$ is to be established.

Construction takes place by the addition of $m \geq 1$ arcs (not in S) with the respective vertices (that may already be in S). The laws of S (as structure maintained by the *PTA*) may or may not allow simple addition of arcs to S . In any general case, however, the weight effect of addition of $m = |A_{new}| - |A_{old}| \geq 1$ arcs⁶ is $\Delta A_{(i,m)} = A_{new} - A_{old}$. Thus the total value of a constructive move is $\|S_{(i+m)}\| = \|S_{(i)}\| + \Delta A_{(i,m)}$. The relative change during construction is:

$$R_i = \frac{\|S_{(i+m)}\|}{\|S_{(i)}\|} = 1 + \frac{\Delta A_{(i,m)}}{\|S_{(i)}\|}, i \geq 2$$

Upon completion of *PTA*, the ‘performance ratio’ is

$$(1) \quad \frac{\|S_{(n)}\|}{\|S_0\|} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Delta A_{(i,m)}}{\|S_{(i)}\|}; \quad n = |S_0|$$

¹The pair $(E : V \times V, (d : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbf{R} | \text{dom}(d) = E))$ is used instead of the standard graph notation $G = (V_E, E)$. Connectivity can be represented by a value $\beta < \infty$, outside solution value bounds, chosen in complement to the optimisation objective.

² $\|X\| = \sum_{e \in X} d(e)$

³There are exactly two extremal values - a minimum $\|S_0\|$ and a maximum $\|S_1\|$

⁴Within the context of these notes, the structure of S need not be considered.

⁵Bracketed subscripts used on solution values to avoid confusion with extremums.

⁶ $_{new}$ arcs are introduced and $_{old}$ arcs are removed, e.g. If construction by Nearest Neighbour is used then $A_{old} = 0$

The *PTA* has a *minimisation* objective, specifiable through the use of the average arc weight:

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho_i &= \frac{i}{i+m} R_i = \frac{i}{i+m} \left(1 + \frac{\Delta A_{(i,m)}}{\|S_{(i)}\|} \right) \leq 1 \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{\Delta A_{(i,m)}}{\|S_{(i)}\|} \leq \frac{m}{i} \end{aligned}$$

Provided (2) is met throughout (it does not really matter if it is not), a (worst-case) construction behaviour can be inferred using (1):

$$(3) \quad 1 \leq \frac{\|S_{(i)}\|}{\|S_0\|} \leq m \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{i} \leq m \log_2 n$$

This is a nice result in its concealment of basic lines of attack to solving some combinatorial optimisation problems, irrespective of their value domains. The point is not ‘*m* exists!’ in (3), but ‘What of value of *m* (or *m_i* for that matter)?’ in relation to (2) in respect of the TSP. Similar result to (3) is given in [2] and confirmed in [1].

* * *

ξ is a bound by virtue of construction behaviour, and is totally unrelated to achievable quality of solution by a *PTA*. ξ is derived as a side-effect of the execution of *PTA* and is just a function of solution structure size.

REFERENCES

1. Marshall Bern and David Eppstein, *Worst-case bounds for subadditive geometric graphs*, Proceedings of the ninth annual symposium on Computational geometry, ACM Press, 1993, pp. 183–188.
2. Timothy Law Snyder and J. Michael Steele, *A priori inequalities for the Euclidean Traveling Salesman*, Proceedings of the eighth annual symposium on Computational geometry, ACM Press, 1992, pp. 344–349.
3. A. G. Yaneff, *On the approximation of the optimal tour length for the TSP*, Talk given at the ACM-SIAM Conference on Discrete Mathematics, August 2002.
4. ———, *Remarks on d-dimensional TSP optimal tour length behaviour*, CoRR (2002), <http://arXiv.org/abs/cs.CG/0209027>.